REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action dated June 5, 2007.

The Examiner objected to the Abstract as being too long. The applicant has amended the Abstract to include less than 150 words.

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as those claimed by co-pending application number 10/722,854. Claims 1-4 have been canceled. New claims 5-14 do not claim the same subject matter as that claimed by the cited application. Furthermore, should any allowed claims in the present application be obvious in light of any previously-allowed claims in the cited co-pending application, or obvious in light of any previously-allowed claims in the parent Application Serial No. 09/465,415 which is also pending, the applicant will file a terminal disclaimer in the present application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Na et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,366,731. Claims 1-4 have been canceled.

Independent claim 5 patentably distinguishes over Na, which fails to disclose the limitations of "copying from a storage medium a plurality of DV-formatted DIF data blocks", "extracting said data from said respective payload sections of at least one DIF data block", and "arranging at least a portion of said data into a format other than DV-formatted data", among many other limitations. In fact, Na seems to exclusively disclose methods of processing purely digital image data, such as MPEG data, which is distinct from DV-formatted data. DV-formatted data is data that digitally stores for later reproduction an analog signal. In other words, a DV encoder samples an incoming analog signal and stores the sampled values on, e.g. a magnetic tape. From the stored sampled values, the original analog signal can then be reproduced for playback already suitable for display on a television or other monitor.

Digital image data, conversely, is originally represented in a digital format, usually by transforming spatial sub-sections of the image into frequency-based DCT blocks, which are then quantized and encoded into a bitstream for storage. Decoding the stored image reproduces the digital bitstream, then reverse-transforms the digital data back into the spatial domain. Since Na

only discloses methods of processing digitally formatted MPEG data, Na neither discloses nor suggests the limitations of claim 5 cited above.

Dependent claim 6 further specifies the limitation that MPEG data is extracted from a DV-formatted DIF block. Dependent claim 8 further specifies the limitation that an MPEG header in the payload portion of the DIF block contains a section indicating an offset value used to specify the position of MPEG data in the DIF data block relative to MPEG data in other DIF data blocks. Neither these limitations nor those of claims 9 and 10 are disclosed by the prior art,

Independent claim 11, along with its dependent claims 12-14 similarly include multiple limitations neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 5-14.

Respectfully submitted,

Kurt Rohlfs
Reg. No. 54,405
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631